

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the detailed Office Action mailed December 18, 2002. Claims 1-23 are currently pending in the application. Applicant requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

35 USC § 103 Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 11-13, 15-17, 22 and 23

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 11-13, 15-17, 22 and 23 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruzzone et al. (U.S. Patent 6,166,797) in view of Shigeta et al. (U.S. 6,266,121). The Examiner states that Bruzzone et al. fails to disclose a light blocking layer. The Examiner states, first without citation to any reference, that it is well known and obvious to place a column spacer in the pixel region. The Examiner, next, goes on to cite Shigeta (specifically column 33, lines 23-32), stating that this reference teaches spacers that function to shield light on regions between the electrodes other than pixel regions, thereby improving contrast. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Neither Bruzzone or Shigeta teach or show any projection located in a light shielding region. As the Examiner states, Bruzzone fails to show a projection in this region. Moreover, reviewing Shigeta, it is clear that this reference fails to teach a projection in a light shielding region. Shigeta, at column 33, lines 23-32 and Fig. 11 cited to by the Examiner, shows a wall like spacer 38. Spacer 38 is NOT positioned in a light shielding region as claimed in the present application. In fact, the only region that even mentions light shielding in Shigeta is the light shield 35, which spacer 38 does not fall within. Accordingly, Shigeta fails to disclose a projection located in a light shielding region.

To the extent that the Examiner references the portions of Shigeta that read that the spacers 38 are optically isotropic, this relates neither to the express language of Applicant's claim nor the intention behind the invention. The Claim does not recite making the projection out of light isotropic material, but instead recites placing the spacer in a light shielding region. Shigeta has nothing to do with this. Moreover, the portions of Shigeta which the Examiner cites to for the statement that "the spacers shield light on regions between the electrodes other than the pixel regions, thereby improving contrast" is misplaced. This language is talking to cross illumination between the pixels, and not to reducing illumination on the projection as in the present invention. Most importantly, however,

Bruzzone and Shigeta fail to teach or suggest every limitation of the claimed invention, and therefore Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection. MPEP § 2143; *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

Claim 5

In addition to the above, the above cited references fail to disclose the projection having an end surface whose area is about  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the area of said light shielding region. Therefore, Applicant submits that Claim 5 is in a condition for allowance.

Claims 11-23

In addition to the above, the above cited references fail to disclose, teach or suggest a method of making a semiconductor according to the steps recited in Claims 11-23. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 11-23 are in a condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submits that the present invention, as claimed, is patentable over the prior art. If the Examiner has any issues which he believes can be expedited by a telephone conference, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned Representative.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

It is believed that any additional fees due with respect to the filing of this paper should be identified in any accompanying transmittal. However, if any additional fees are required in connection with the filing of this paper that are not identified in any accompanying transmittal, permission is given to charge Deposit Account 18-0013 in the name of Rader, Fishman & Grauer PLLC.

Respectfully submitted,

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Ronald P. Kananen, Registration No.; 24,104  
Rader, Fishman & Grauer PLLC  
Libn Building  
1233 20<sup>th</sup> Street N.W., Suite 501  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
CUSTOMER NO. 23353  
(202) 955-3750  
*Attorney for Applicants*